

Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi *Tar. Bil. Der.*

Dergi web sayfası: www.agri.ankara.edu.tr/dergi Journal of Agricultural Sciences

Journal homepage: www.agri.ankara.edu.tr/journal

# **Fatigue Life Enhancement of Three Point Hitch System Brackets in the Garden Series Tractors**

# **İbrahim Savaş DALMIŞ<sup>a</sup> , Olcay TEZCANb , Sait Özmen ERUSLUa**

*a Namık Kemal University, Çorlu Engineering Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering, 59860, Çorlu, Tekirdağ, TURKEY b Hema Hydraulic Machinery Industry and Trade Company, 59500, Çerkezköy, Tekirdağ, TURKEY*

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

Research Article Corresponding Author: İbrahim Savaş DALMIŞ, E-mail: idalmis@nku.edu.tr, Tel: +90 (282) 250 23 45 Received: 28 January 2015, Received in Revised Form: 21 November 2015, Accepted: 22 November 2015

#### **ABSTRACT**

The main objective of this research was to enhance the fatigue performance of the brackets found in the three point hitch system used in garden series tractors. This was achieved by using experimental tests and finite element analysis. The manufactured brackets were validated with fatigue rig tests, namely a lifting capacity test, a push-pull test and a liftinglowering test. The lifting capacity test of three point hitch mechanism was established according to ISO 730-1 standards. In addition to the lift capacity test, problems were also experienced with the cylinder clamping brackets during the pushpull tests. The bracket brakeage occurred during the 11,218<sup>th</sup> test cycle. According to the test results and finite element analysis, the brackets were strengthened at critical damage points. The thickness of the bracket connection surface was increased from 12 mm to 19 mm and the bracket material was changed from GG25 to GG35. The enhanced brackets passed the tests without any breakage.

Keywords: Hydraulic lift; Three point hitch mechanism; Push-pull tests; Lifting-lowering tests; Fatigue analysis; Stress analysis

# **Bahçe Tipi Traktörlerin Üç Nokta Askı Sistemi Braketlerinin Yorulma Ömürlerinin İyileştirilmesi**

#### **ESER BİLGİSİ**

Araştırma Makalesi Sorumlu Yazar: İbrahim Savaş DALMIŞ, E-posta: idalmis@nku.edu.tr, Tel: +90 (282) 250 23 45 Geliş Tarihi: 28 Ocak 2015, Düzeltmelerin Gelişi: 21 Kasım 2015, Kabul: 22 Kasım 2015

#### **ÖZET**

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı bahçe tipi traktörlerde kullanılan hidrolik kaldırıcılı üç nokta askı sistemi bağlantı braketlerinin yorulma performanslarını iyileştirmektir. Bu amaca deneysel ve sonlu elemanlar analizi yardımıyla ulaşılmıştır. Üretilmiş olan braketlere kaldırma kapasitesi testi, çek bırak testi ve indir kaldır yorulma testleri uygulanmıştır. Kaldırma kapasitesi testleri ISO 730-1 standartlarına göre gerçekleştirilmiştir. Kaldırma kapasitesi testlerine ek olarak uygulanan çek bırak testlerinde silindir bağlantı braketlerinde problemler gözlenmiştir. Denemelerin 11218. çevriminde braketlerde kırılmalar görülmüştür. Test sonuçları ve sonlu elemanlar analizlerine göre braketlerin kritik hasar bölgeleri güçlendirilmiştir. Braket bağlantı yüzeyinin kalınlığı 12 mm'den 19 mm'ye çıkartılmıştır ve GG25 olan braket malzemesi GG35 olarak değiştirilmiştir. İyileştirilen braketler, deneysel testleri kırılma olmadan tamamlamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hidrolik kaldırıcı; Üç nokta askı sistemi; Çek bırak testi; İndir kaldır testi; Yorulma analizi; Gerilme analizi

© Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi

# **1. Introduction**

The attachments of three point hitch (TPH) systems are mainly implemented in hydraulic lift design (Keçecioğlu & Gülsoylu 2005). The design of an adjustable three point hitch system (TPH) affects the force imposed on lift and tractor equipment (Al-Jalil et al 2001). Previous studies on TPH mechanisms were mainly focused on the transition of tillage forces between tillage implements and tractors, a factor which is extremely important for both operational efficiency and energy management (Alimardani et al 2008; Askari et al 2011).

Otmianowski (1983) expressed that all agricultural machines working on farms are exposed to dynamic loads during tillage especially at bed-like farmlands. Sule et al (2007) studied three-point lift system oscillations during the drafting and implementation of transport, resulting in partial parts failure of the lift system such as the stabilizer bracket. The dynamic behavior of a tractor lift system was modelled by many researchers (Laceklis-Bertmanis & Kronbergs 2010; Laceklis-Bertmanis et al 2013). In these works, the Working Model software for a tractor three point hitch-system with small amplitude oscillation simulations was used. Kolator & Białobrzewski (2011) developed a 2D model for working tractors which was implemented on various types of soil. Portes et al (2013) developed a model which transformed the load on the three-point linkage to the tractor driving wheels. Computer aided engineering analysis led to significant cooperation between design and testing departments. Agricultural machines are subjected to various loads according to different parameters, such as soil conditions and operation types throughout their working life. In order to asses fatigue life, strain data from maximum stressed locations must be obtained

or estimated (Chisholm & Harral 1989). Koike & Tanaka (1976) measured the strains at tractor's rear axle housing, to calculate fatigue strength under random load conditions. Mattetti et al (2012) collected strain data from an 80 kW tractor and used field data for accelerated life tests. Paraforos et al (2013) investigated the fatigue properties of tractor chassis and axle housing under random vibration conditions based on dynamic road loads.

Khan et al (2007) expressed that measurement studies increased as different types of transducers were developed and implemented on test samples. Goodwin et al (1993) developed a triaxial dynamometer for measuring the forces and moments along orthogonal axis. Data acquisition and varying strain-gauge systems were also used by many researchers to evaluate the effects of on the three-point hitch mechanism (Al-Janobi 2000).

A prediction of fatigue failure is important for determining effective design parameters for final production. The best-known fatigue analysis procedures are stress-life, strain-life and crack propagation methods (Socie & Marquis 2000). The stress-life method is generally accepted in the case of high-cycle fatigue problems. Using this method, the stress amplitude can be evaluated with an S-N or Wöhler curve (Radaj 1995). The stress life approach assumes all stresses occur below the elastic limit at all times. Strain life approach is applicable to low cycle fatigue problems.

In this study, the fatigue life of the tractor lift bracket was studied using experimental tests. The push-pull and lifting-lowering tests were additional tests to the standard lifting capacity test. The lifting capacity test results were compared with theoretical calculations based on ISO-

730-1 standards (ISO 1994). The parameters of pushpull and lifting-lowering tests, the leading sources of stress on the brackets, were calculated from the static equilibrium of mechanism. Then, strain life-based fatigue life predictions (Coffin-Manson approach) were calculated using finite element analysis. In experimental studies, broken brackets in the critical equipment were observed using push-pull tests and lifting-lowering tests. Critical damage points of the brackets were determined by cyclic loading. The brackets were then redesigned, dependent on the results.

# **2. Material and Methods**

# *2.1. Design criteria of hydraulic lift*

For this research, the brackets of the hydraulic lift cylinder in garden series tractors were investigated. Pistons were attached directly to the external lifting arms, as can be seen in Figure 1. Hydraulic lifts with external cylinders were preferred for high lifting capacity, easy assembly and servicing capabilities. The hydraulic lifts for the three point hitch mechanisms were designed according to ISO 730-1 standards. The technical properties of the hydraulic lift are given in Table 1. The three point hitch system and hydraulic lift mechanism can be seen in Figure 2.



**Figure 1- Externally cylindered hydraulic lifts** *Şekil 1- Dıştan silindirli hidrolik kaldırıcı*

# **Table 1- Three point hitch system and hydraulic lift properties**

*Çizelge 1- Üç nokta askı sistemi ve hidrolik kaldırıcı özellikleri*

Property	Value
TPH category	2
Lifting capacity (kg)	3200
System safety pressure (bar)	195
Flow rate $(L \text{ min}^{-1})$	30
Cylinder diameter (mm)	60
Upper lift arm $(A)$	280
Side suspension arm length (B)	650
Lower lift arm seam $(C)$	405
Lower lift arm length $(D)$	900
Top link $(E)$	750
Equipment height $(F)$	610
Equipment from the center of gravity $(G)$	610



**Figure 2- Three point hitch system and hydraulic lift mechanism**

*Şekil 2- Üç nokta askı sistemi ve hidrolik kaldırıcı mekanizması*

# *2.2. Lifting capacity test*

The theoretical lifting capacity was calculated after the first design sketches. Lifting capacity for the final design was tested in line with ISO 730 static capacity test procedure. Lifting capacity was tested with a hydraulic lift test setup that can be seen in Figure 3.

The hydraulic lift cylinders were pressurized with an externally integrated pump and the rods were raised. The pressure was controlled by a manometer installed between the hydraulic lift and pump. The lifting rods were connected via suitable apparatus to the load cell. Lifting capacity was measured with an Esit TB S-Type 5000 kg capacity load cell with an accuracy class of C3, in accordance with OIML R60. Hydraulic pressure of 190 Bar was applied to the cylinders. Per-second data from the load cell and



**Figure 3- Lifting capacity test setup** *Şekil 3- Kaldırma kapasitesi test düzeneği*

sensors was collected during the experiments by a National Instruments PCIe-6363 data acquisition system and a LabVIEW-based data logger program. The results were compared with theoretical lifting capacity calculations.

During the cycle, effective loads for the TPH system were also established using static equilibrium calculations of the mechanism, which can be seen *Şekil 3- Kaldırma kapasitesi test düzeneği* below. Loads placed on the TPH mechanism were calculated using the Equation 1-3, with the angles given in Figure 4. calculated using the Equation 1-3, with the angles calculated using the Equation 1-3, with the angles  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

$$
F_s = P_{hyd.p.} A \tag{1}
$$

expressed as follows. The equilibrium of AB rod and ED rod are expressed as follows.

 $\sum M_A = 0$ ,  $F_S \cos(\theta_p) l_{AP} - F_{bc} \cos(\theta_2) l_{AB} = 0$  (2)  $\overline{a}$  $\Sigma_{1}$  (3)  $\cup_{1}$  (3)  $\cup_{1}$  (3)  $\cup_{2}$  (3)  $\cup_{2}$  (3)  $\cup_{2}$  (3)  $\cup_{2}$  (3) ì  $\Sigma M_D = 0$ ,  $F_k \cos (\theta_4) l_{ED} - F_{bc} \cos (\theta_3) l_{CD} = 0$  (3)



**Figure 4- Three point hitch mechanism** *Şekil 4- Üç nokta askı sistemi mekanizması*

The parameters used in the calculations are given at Table 2. These parameters were determined ting capacity test setup from the experiments. The angles of the TPH rods aldırma kapasitesi test düzeneği **were varied according to external rod** angle  $(\theta_1)$ .

the experiments. The angles of the TPH rods were varied according to external rod angle (1).  $l_{AP} = 157.88$  mm,  $l_{AB} = 275$  mm,  $l_{CD} = 405$  mm,  $l_{DE} = 900$  mm.

# Table 2- Variables of TPH mechanism used in **equilibrium calculations**

*Hydraulic cylinder data <sup>1</sup> <sup>p</sup> <sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup> Hydraulic cylinder data <sup>1</sup> <sup>p</sup> <sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup> Çizelge 2- Hesaplamalarında kullanılan TPH*  -30 33.09 45.9 36.34 20.44 *mekanizması değişkenleri*

Hydraulic cylinder data	$\theta$	$\theta_{\rm p}$	$\theta$ <sub>2</sub>	$\theta$	$\theta_{\scriptscriptstyle A}$	
	-30	33.09		45.9 36.34 20.44		
	$-20$		20.10 35.19 29.59		14.40	
	$-10$		9.04 24.85 22.82		7.97	
160 mm diameter	$\Omega$		1.23 14.82 16.14		1.33	
	10	10.84		5.06 9.55	5.41	
150 bar pressure	20	19.93	4.44	3.45	12.11	
	30			28.58 13.68 2.37	18.69	
	40		35.89 22.64		7.68 25.04	
	50	44.94	31.28 12.38		31.07	

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  system were equipped with hydraulic lift apparatus at a  $\frac{8}{100}$ Hydraulic lift test apparatus was used for the pushpull test. The external bars of a hydraulic  $\text{I\text{I}t}$  if  $\text{I\text{P}}$ were j were placed between the hydraulic pipe and the hydraulic lift for measuring pressure variations. The lower lifting arms of the TPH system were equipped with hydraulic lift apparatus at a 610 mm distance. A 1000 kg impulsive load was applied at the tip of TPH mechanism. The load was calculated using load cells at the tip of the piston, as seen in Figure 5. In these experiments, 40,000 cycles were found to be the optimum cycle count-where a bracket completed 40,000 cycles without any breakage, and passed load capacity tests and lifting-lowering tests. The pushpull test periods of 40,000 cycles were completed in approximately 55 hours (one cycle takes 5 seconds).

#### *2.4. Lifting-lowering test*

This was carried out in order to study the hydraulic lift system functions and to test the strength of the equipment, as seen in Figure 6. The test was also used for validation of the push-pull test at the final design stage of the brackets.



placed between the hydraulic pipe and the hydraulic lift for measuring pressure variations. The lower placed between the hydraulic pipe and the hydraulic lift for measuring pressure variations. The lower *2.3. Push-pull test* **Figure 5- Push-pull test setup**

lifting arms of the TPH system were equipped with hydraulic lift apparatus at a 610 mm distance. A 1000 *Şekil 5- Çek bırak test düzeneği*



**Figure 6- Lifting-lowering test setup** *Şekil 6- İndir kaldır test düzeneği*

A steel load basket connected to the three-point let **Figure 7- Figure 7- Convergence study of the lifting-lowering tests. Figure 7- points** and **Figure 7- Convergence study of**  $\theta$ The load basket at the tip of TPH system was raised the con and lowered to the highest and lowest lifting points respectively. The gravity center of the basket was positioned 610 mm in height from lower arms. The basket was filled with 1200 kg of cast iron weights. One cycle was completed, with the lifting and lowering of the load basket taking 4 seconds. The position of the lower arms was determined by digital output proxy sensors. This process was repeated until a cycle count of 40,000 was achieved.

# *2.5. Finite element analysis of bracket*

Finite element analysis was performed using ANSYS unyielding nature of *S*-*x a*<sup>*-x*</sup> *a*<sup>*-x*</sup> *a*<sup>*-x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *b a*<sup>*x*</sup> *a*<sup>*x*</sup> *b a*<sup>*</sup>* the stress and fatigue performance of brackets. The final design was achieved according to this analysis. The critical damage points of the brackets were determined under cyclic loading. Model mesh were determined under cyclic loading. Moder files  $GG35$  are given (ASM 1996).<br>density was determined by convergence study of the  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  and the finite element and  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  and the finite element and the finite e bracket, as seen in Figure 7. The lifting-lowering blacket, as seen in Figure 7. The inting-lowering<br>test load procedure was used to convergence study. The finite element approximation of stress analysis First finite cleared approximation of success analysis  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$ boundary conditions and applied mesh at the finite  $\frac{1}{2}$ element model are given in Figure 8. Calculated expected was determined by convergence study of the<br>acket as seen in Figure 7. The lifting-lowering The strain life was calculated using the Equation 4. bundary conditions and applied mesh at the finite The results of the finite element analysis are

loads at Equation 1-3 were applied to lower rod joints and cylinder rod joints, respectively and then the connections of the brackets were fixed. *<i>A* and an equation 1-3 were applied to lower rod

**Figure 8- a, mesh detail at finite element model; b, boundary conditions** 

At first, stage stress analyses of the brackets were performed. Nonlinear analysis with a multi-linear protropic hardening material model was applied to  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $T_{\text{eff}}$  is the calculation of  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $T_{\text{eff}}$  are used for the static stress analyses. Then strain life, based on the States stress analyses. Then strain me, sales on the fatigue life of the brackets. The stress of the In the fatigue life of the bruckets. The stress of the critical breakage planes was evaluated according to erfitted breakage planes was evaluated according to the maximum principle stresses of the finite element analysis. The maximum principle stresses of the finite element used for the calculation of fatigue life because of the **Table 3- Strain life parameters of bracket materials** unyielding nature of GG materials. *Çizelge 3- Braket malzemelerinin gerilme ömür parametreleri*

Strain life-based, fatigue life-approximation was tress and fatigue performance of brackets.<br>First decident was askinged assembly to this is found in the experiments. In Table 3, the strain and strain stress analyses and the stress analyses and the stress and the stress and the stress and the stress and the stress and the stress and the stress and the stress alysis. The critical damage points of the brackets life parameters of the bracket materials GG25 and  $\frac{1}{2}$ GG35 are given (ASM 1996).

$$
\frac{\Delta \varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon_f (2N_f)^c + \frac{\sigma_f}{E} (2N_f)^b \tag{4}
$$

given in the related test sections.

#### **Table 3- Strain life parameters of bracket materials Table 3- Strain life parameters of bracket materials** *Çizelge 3- Braket malzemelerinin gerilme ömür parametreleri*

*Çizelge 3- Braket malzemelerinin gerilme ömür parametreleri*





**Figure 7- Convergence study of bracket finite element model**

*Şekil 7- Braket sonlu elemanlar modelinin yakınsama çalışması*



**Figure 8- a, mesh detail at finite element model; b, boundary conditions**

*Şekil 8- a, sonlu elemanlar modeli mesh detayı; b, sınır koşulları*

# **3. Results and Discussion**

# *3.1. Lifting capacity test Results and bracket reaction forces for additional tests*

The experimental results of the lifting capacity were compared with the static equilibrium calculations Example 2 what the state equinorial extenditions (Figure 9). According to the results of the Chi-Square test, there is no significant difference between the theoretical calculations and experimental test results  $\begin{vmatrix} -40 \\ 40 \end{vmatrix}$  $(P= 0.056 > 0.05)$ .



Figure 9- Comparison of experimental and theoretical calculation result of the lifting capacity  $\begin{bmatrix} \infty & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ 

Şekil 9- Kaldırma kapasitesinin deneysel ve teorik  $\qquad \qquad \Box$  $hesaplama sonuçlarının karsılaştırılması 1<sup>-40</sup>$ 

The TPH system cycle time was obtained from  $\mathbf{F_{i}}$ Reaction forces acting on cylinder rod joints were the load placed at the tip of the TPH mechanism. joints on the push-pull test varied, according to cylinder rod joints. Reaction forces of the bracket external rod angle, were applicable at lower rod and of the lifting-lowering tests, obtained for the  $0^\circ$ that the theoretical maximum reaction force results 1-3 as seen in Figure 10-12. It can be seen here calculated from equilibrium equations at Equation mechanism brackets, relative to the test loads, were n<br>Ee<br>ind experimental tests. Cyclic loads applied to the TPH found to be higher than on lower rod joints because of hydraulic cylinder reactions. In push-pull tests, an impulsive load factor of 1.3 was determined from test data and fatigue life calculations.

#### *3.2. Additional test results*

During the experimental push-pull tests, the breakage points of the brackets designed are shown *Sekil 12*in Figure 13. Breakage occurred after 11,218 cycles.



on lower rod joints because of hydraulic cylinder reactions. In push-pull tests, an impulsive load factor of

**Example 10-** Reaction forces acting on brackets lower **rod joint (LRJ) at the lifting-lowering test**

*Şekil 10- İndir kaldır testinde, braket alt rod bağlantılarında oluşan reaksiyon kuvvetleri*



**Figure 11- Reaction forces acting on brackets cylinder rod joint (CRJ) at the lifting-lowering tests Figure 11- Reaction forces acting on brackets**  *Şekil 11- İndir kaldır testlerindeki braket silindir rod bağlantılarında oluşan reaksiyon kuvvetleri* **cylinder rod joint (CRJ) at the lifting-lowering tests** *Şekil 11- İndir kaldır testlerindeki braket silindir rod bağlantılarında oluşan reaksiyon kuvvetleri*



Figure 12- Reaction forces acting on brackets joints **at the push-pull test**

cles. oluşan reaksiyon kuvvetleri *Şekil 12- Çek bırak testindeki braket bağlantılarında* 

When the final design of the brackets was tested, it completed a full 40,000 cycles test period. During the lifting-lowering tests of the original bracket design, breakage occurred after 12,500 cycles. In comparison, the final bracket design completed a full 50,000 cycles test period without breakage. The difference between the two tests was the effect of impulsive load at the tip of the TPH mechanism. It was therefore assessed that push-pull tests give additional information about TPH mechanisms under impulsive load conditions.



**Figure 13- Brackets breakage points at the pushpull tests**

*Şekil 13- Çek bırak testinde braketlerde oluşan kırılma noktaları*

# *3.3. Finite element results*

The analysis results of the failure zone, estimated by the finite element analysis, was compatible with the experimental results seen in fatigue life results, as seen in Figure 14-15. According to the test and analysis results, the breakage planes and maximum stress regions were determined, and the thickness of the connection surface of the brackets was increased from 12 mm to 19 mm. This modification increased



# **Figure 14- Finite element analysis results of first design brackets at push-pull tests; a, the maximum stresses at the bracket; b, the results of the safety factor**

*Şekil 14- İlk tasarım braketlerin çek-bırak testi için sonlu elemanlar analizi sonuçları; a, braketlerdeki maksimum gerilmeler; b, emniyet faktörü sonuçları*

the weight of the bracket from 4,540 to 4,800 g. The breakage section of the bracket was redesigned, as seen in Figure 16, and the material of the brackets was changed from GG25 to GG35. As a result of the new design, the stress placed on the fracture plane was reduced from 503 MPa to 371 MPa for the pushpull tests, as seen in Figure 17. It can be seen that the maximum stress variation across the thickness was reduced by the new design of the brackets.

The analysis results of redesigned brackets at the lifting-lowering test are given in Figure 18. It can be seen here that maximum stresses were only 274 MPa and were reduced along the cross section at brackets. These results correlated with the push-pull tests. Similar maximum stress regions were found



**Figure 15- Brackets fatigue life results at finite element analysis**

*Şekil 15- Sonlu elemanlar analizindeki braket yorulma ömrü sonuçları*



# **Figure 16- Bracket enhancements according to push-pull test results; a, first designed bracket; b, final design enhanced bracket**

*Şekil 16- Çek-bırak test sonuçlarına göre braket iyileştirmeleri; a, ilk tasarlanan braket; b, iyileştirilmiş son tasarlanan braket*



**Figure 17- Finite element analysis results of optimized brackets at push-pull tests; a, the maximum stresses at the bracket; b, the results of the fatigue life**

*Şekil 17- Optimize edilen braketlerin çek-bırak testi için sonlu elemanlar analizi sonuçları; a, braketlerdeki maksimum gerilmeler; b, yorulma ömür sonuçları*



**Figure 18- Finite element analysis results of optimized brackets at lifting-lowering tests; a, the maximum stresses at the bracket; b, the results of the fatigue life**

*Şekil 18- Optimize edilen braketlerin indir-kaldır testi için sonlu elemanlar analizi sonuçları; a, braketlerdeki maksimum gerilmeler; b, yorulma ömür sonuçları*

for both tests. However, stress values obtained from the lifting-lowering tests were lower than those from the push-pull tests where the impulsive load effect on the TPH tip was a factor.

TPH mechanisms are generally tested according to Iso Standart Static Test methods. Some studies are focused on calculations and failure analysis of oscillations or dynamic loads acting on TPH mechanisms during drafting and implementations Otmianowski (1983), Sule et al (2007). There is not any test procedure is developed according to these dynamic loads. In our study newly developed tests on TPH mechanisms under impulsive dynamic loads are presented implemented to standard tests.

#### **4. Conclusions**

In the analysis, the boundary conditions were determined from system operating conditions. The maximum stress regions were examined comprehensively.

Improved safety factor results at the critical points were achieved by the material, shape and thickness modifications of the brackets. For this paper, three experimental test methods and finite element modeling were used in order to establish a methodology that could assess fatigue life in agricultural machine parts, namely the push-pull test, the lifting-lowering test and the lifting capacity test. In these experiments, it was seen that the pushpull test in particular was a very effective tool in determining the fatigue life of three point hitch system components. The results show that if any part of the TPH mechanism could complete 40,000 cycles of the push-pull test, it was also capable of passing the other tests. Therefore it was concluded that push-pull test data was implemented the standard tests for TPH mechanisms in order to assess impulsive loading.

### **Acknowledgements**

Part of this research was supported by the Namik Kemal University as a MSc. Thesis Project No. NKUBAP.00.17.YL.12.08. The authors would also like to thank the HEMA Hydraulic Machinery Industry and Trade Co., Tekirdag/Turkey for their technical support in the analysis and experimental processes.



# **References**

- Al-Jalil H F, Khadir A & Mukahal W (2001). Design and performance of an adjustable three-point hitch dynamometer. *Soil and Tillage Research* **62**: 153-156
- Al-Janobi A (2000). A data-acquisition system to monitor performance of fully mounted implements. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* **75**: 167-175
- Alimardani R, Fazel Z, Akram A, Mahmoudi A & Varnamkhasti M G (2008). Design and development of a three-point hitch dynamometer. *Journal of Agricultural Technology* **4**: 37-52
- Askari M, Komarizade M H, Nikbakht A M, Nobakht N & Teimourlou R F (2011). A novel three-point hitch dynamometer to measure the draft requirement of mounted implements. *Research in Agricultural Engineering* **57**(4): 128-136
- ASM (1996). ASM Handbook. *Fatigue and Fracture* **19**: 963-979
- Chisholm C J & Harral B B (1989). The prediction of implement fatigue life. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* **42**(3): 203-218
- Goodwin R J, Reynolds A J, O'Dogherty M J & Al-Ghazal A A (1993). A triaxial dynamometer for force and moment measurement on tillage implements. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* **55**(3): 189-205
- ISO (1994). ISO 730-1 Agricultural wheeled tractors-Rear-mounted three-point linkage. International standard
- Keçecioğlu G & Gülsoylu E (2005). Tarım Traktörleri. Ege Üniversitesi Yayınları Ziraat Fakültesi Yayın No: 565, 241 s
- Khan J, Godwin R J, Kilgour J & Blackmore B S (2007). Design and calibration of a bi-axial extended octagonal ring transducer system for the measurement of tractor-implement forces. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences* **2**(1): 16-20
- Koike M & Tanaka T (1976). Analysis on the structural strength of tractor frame part III. *Journal of Japanese Society of Agricultural Machinery* **38**(2): 169-175
- Kolator B & Białobrzewski I (2011). A simulation model of 2WD tractor performance. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* **76**(2): 231-239
- Laceklis-Bertmanis J & Kronbergs E (2013). Model of hydropneumatic three point hitch. In: *Proceeding of the 12th International Scientific Conference, Engineering for Rural Development*, 23-24 May, Jelgava, Latvia, pp. 49-54
- Laceklis-Bertmanis J, Pirs V & Jesko Z (2010). Investigation of pressure oscillation in hydraulic hitch-system. In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development"*, 19-21 May, Jelgava: LUA, Latvia, pp. 95-99
- Mattetti M, Molari G & Sedoni E (2012). Methodology for the realization of accelerated structural tests on tractors. *Biosystems Engineering* **113**(3): 266-271
- Otmianowski T (1983). Procesy odnowy maszyn rolniczych. PWRiL. Warszawa
- Paraforos D S, Griepentrog H W & Sturmfels W (2013). New methodology to assess and test the durability of agricultural machinery. In: *Proceedings VDI-MEG AgEng*, Hanover, Germany, pp. 407-412
- Portes P, Bauer F & Čupera J (2013). Laboratoryexperimental verification of calculation of force effects in tractor's three-point hitch acting on driving wheels. *Soil and Tillage Research* **128**: 81-90
- Radaj D (1995). Ermüdungsfestigkeit, *Springer Verlag*, Berlin, Germany
- Socie D F & Marquis G B (2000). Multiaxial fatigue, *Society of Automotive Engineers,* Warrendale PA, USA
- Sule S, Jatau J S & Yisa M G (2007). Development of a model stress equation for the steyr tractor lift system. *Agricultural Engineering International: The CIGR Ejournal* **9**: PM 07 030